Dear Moo.

In speaking to you yesterday, I forgot to suggest that it is fine if there is anyone to whom you'd like to make the complaint available. Like Ed Devenport or any other not unfriendly reporter.

It associates you with nothing, but it does, inherebtly, support you and it does, rather overwhelmingly, prove the government <u>does</u> suppress, even what never in our history has ever been suppressed, the <u>public</u> record of a public trial.

And lies about it, very nigh up in the Justice Department.

It is the test grist for your mill. It makes no difference to me, and there is no way it fan help me.

However, it is also the kind of thing that might make the difference in the case of someone unable to make up his mindto come forward and say what he known.

As you may have realized, anile I consider the explanation you gave of the filing of the Shaw civil suit possible, I am not opersuaded it is probable. This may the enermous opportunity you have in a wivil suit as compared with the limitations of a criminal one id enough to make me ask if Wegmann is this crazy or this money-hungry, is Shaw? Is everyone he knows who knew of the possibility?

I realize that what I postulate is not susceptible of readymproof, but I hope you will be alert to the possibilities and let me know if you pick up anything tending to confirm or suggest confirmation.

Until we are face-to-face, I do not want to tell you the whole story of how I know there was an immediate Shaw "investigation" or by whom. I tell you this much more than I did by phone: I was told personally and by the responsible official. He said they could find nothing to support this immediate suspicion. I have a rather strange relationship with him. When you return the Trunbach report, please send me a couple of extra copies. I think I'll send him one. Please also keep me posted on the results of your questioning, for I may be able to carry it further or fit it with other things. If it is not probable it also is not worth overlooking.

Sincerely,